has been cognizant of this discrimination for quite some time. A U.N. Institute for Training and Research report in 1973 documented this discrimination. It stated:

As of May 31, 1972, the overall proportion of men to women on the professional staff was 4 to 1, but at the directorial level, the gap widened to 37 to 1. Of the 293 men and eight women in the ranks from D-1 (Director) to USG (Under Secretary General), 30 men were at the level of Assistant of Under Secretary General, while no woman was higher than D-2 (Director). From "The Situation of Women in the United Nations".

The situation remains essentially unchanged today. Reports were issued during International Women's Year pointing out the situation and imploring change. What was the result? The International Women's Year Conference adopted resolution 8 urging that something be done to end this discrimination. Another resolution passed the U.N. on December 8, 1975 urging that the U.N. increase its efforts to hire women for executive positions. I was surprised to see such honesty in the resolutions, as it noted—

The limited progress made to date in the recruitment and promotion of women in the senior and policy-making positions, and the declining percentage of women staff members in the Secretariat.

Yet I remain unconvinced by all these resolutions. Simply because the situation has not changed. I am reminded of Eliza Doolittle in "My Fair Lady," who sang "It's been words, words, words, and I'm so sick of words,"—in the showstopper, "Show Me."

As a member of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, I have had a chance to take a closer look at several of the U.N. organizations to which we make a voluntary contribution. The following is a listing of some of the U.N. organizations, the number of women in executive positions, and the amount of money we voluntarily contributed in 1975.

VOLUNTARY U.N. ORGANIZATIONS RECEIVING U.S. FUNDING—1975 DOLLAR AMOUNT

1. U.N. Development Program—of 41 top positions listed in U.N.'s System of Organization Manual, there is only one woman.—$77 million.

2. UNICEF—of the top 17 positions, there is only one woman.—$17 million.

3. U.N. Institute for Training and Research—there are no women in executive positions.—$400,000.

4. U.N. Relief Agency for Palestine Refugees—there are no women in executive positions.—$23 million.

5. U.N. World Food Program—there are no women in executive positions.—$1.5 million.

I think the example of UNICEF is particularly instructive. Of the eight executive positions, there is only one woman. She is not on the Executive Board, and she is not even secretary to the Executive Board. She is director of the greeting card operation. UNICEF may be the best in its purposes, but it is as guilty as the rest of them in its bias against women.

I think the United States should take a more active role in pressuring the U.N. to make real changes in its hiring practices. Last year, we contributed about $125 million to these voluntary organizations, in addition to the assessed dues we pay the U.N. We have every right to call the U.N. to task for their discrimination against women. If the U.N. does not move quickly and decisively on this issue, decent men and women everywhere must condemn it for this and other reasons—simply one more immorality committed by that organization.

COMMENTARY ON CONFERENCE REPORT ON HATCH ACT

(Mr. DERWINSKI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, those responsible for crafting and creating legislation ostensibly designed to update the Hatch Act now are in the unenviable position of being left with a medley of absurdities which boggle the mind of any impartial observer. Like new authors, they must be stealing glances at the latest version of their handiwork to make sure that the ink has not smudged.

In their headlong rush to perpetuate the fallacious thesis that Federal employees somehow were being deprived of their constitutional rights, proponents succeeded in transforming a patently mischievous piece of legislation into a monumental monstrosity. There is no other way to assess the language which has been incorporated into the conference committee report on H.R. 8617. In effect, it asks us to clap our hands, if we still believe in Peter Pan.

When this legislation was debated earlier in the House, proponents trumpeted the need for all Federal employees to be free to exercise their political rights. At the same time, they cautioned against establishing a double standard which they said would result if senior officials in the administration were permitted to seek elective office. If the all-for-one, one-for-all principle was valid last October, why has it now been abandoned by the House managers of this bill?

It is not too difficult to come up with an answer. Principle was sacrificed for political expediency. What the House managers of this bill now are telling us is that a little bit of selectivity is not incompatible with political freedom. How else can you explain away the language of the conference committee report which now would deny the full range of political activity to certain employees of the CIA, the IRS, and the Justice Department?

In view of the conference report, I think it is appropriate to repeat the question chorused by backers of this legislation when they objected to the so-called double standard approach to political activity: "What kind of equity is this?" There can be no justification for permitting one kind of Federal employee free political rein while restricting selected groups of Federal employees.

Let me also remind the House it was the same backers of this legislation who last October were voicing concern about the "fragmented nature and coverage of the Hatch Act." Now, if we are to believe these same spokesmen, a little bit of political segregation is only a venial sin which can be conveniently overlooked in the rush to legislative enactment.

In their all-out drive to put something into the law books, House backers of the legislation even jettisoned the effective date of the measure. When it left the House, H.R. 8617 was to be applicable for the 1976 elections. Presumably, that effective date would give a new dimension to political freedom for Federal employees since it coincided with our Bicentennial observance. Now, the House is being asked to reverse its stand and delay the effective date of the bill until January 1, 1977. If political freedom really is the issue, can we tolerate any delay?

But there is an even more compelling reason for rejecting the conference report, and it can be summed up in a word—experience. Since 1939, the Hatch Act has demonstrated its worth and provided Federal employees with the assurance they are rated on quality of job performance rather than political connections.

There is no conceivable way of preserving an impartial Federal service, if it is to be ravaged at will by virtually unrestricted partisan political activity. To invite the emasculation of a workable merit system is to encourage a quick return to the spoils system complete with pestilential stench.

There is widespread evidence that neither the public nor the vast majority of Federal employees want this bill enacted into law. In the interests of good government, this deplorable piece of legislation which now encompasses the worst of both worlds should be soundly rejected.

PANAMA CANAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. EDWARDS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, negotiations between our Government and the Republic of Panama over future ownership of the Panama Canal are continuing despite a strong sentiment among the people of this country that the United States should retain ownership.

Although the negotiations are taking place at a slower pace, it is unknown at present just how far the talks will be carried.

I strongly oppose any change in the ownership of this strategically-important link between the Atlantic and the Pacific Oceans and I have introduced legislation calling on the Congress to state its opposition clearly and unequivocally.

As you all recall, when the Department of State appropriation bill came before the House last year, language was included to prohibit the State Department from using any funds for the purpose of negotiating the giveaway of the canal. I supported this language and it is unfortunate that the Senate did not add any similar language. The House language was watered down in conference and we finally ended up with a provision which had no binding effect.

I firmly believe that if the canal ceases to exist as an entity of the United States and is relinquished to the Republic of Panama, it will just be a matter of time before the operation of the canal is under the influence of Fidel Castro, supported by the Soviet Union.

Russia has constantly supported the efforts of Panama to gain control of the Canal. It has been reported that the Russians have even expressed an interest in building a new sea-level canal or modifying the present canal to handle larger vessels, similar to the manner in which the Russians did the Aswan Dam for the Egyptians.

Obtaining ownership and control of the Canal from the United States has been a long-time goal of the Russians. John Reed, an American journalist who covered the Russian revolution, reported that Lenin realized the importance of the canal and was determined to force the United States to give up unilateral control of the waterway.

The strategic nature of the canal to international commerce and to the military defense of the Western Hemisphere are two good reasons why the United States should never let the canal slip from its control.

The United States completed construction of the canal in 1914 after 10 long years of hard work. We took up the project after the French had failed. The United States paid Panama $10 million and agreed to pay $250,000 a year rent forever for the area. Since then, the annual payment has been raised to $2 million a year.

The cost to the United States of building the canal was $380 million.

A revolutionary coup headed by Brig. Gen. Omar Torrijos of the National Guard has been in control of Panama since President Arnolfo Arias was overthrown in 1968, 11 days after he was elected. This military regime of Panama has been friendly with Communist countries and has been agitating for control of the canal.

Panamanians are divided on the canal issue and militant factions have threatened bloodshed if the canal is not relinquished. Our two countries have been involved in negotiations and debate for years.

I do not like the direction in which we are going on this issue. Unless we can reverse the trend of recent years, one day we may be asking the Russians for permission to use the canal. This is unthinkable and I strongly urge each of you to do everything possible to keep such a situation from occurring.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. KEMP) is recognized for 60 minutes.

[Mr. KEMP addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANNUNZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. ANNUNZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ) is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. GONZALEZ addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

DEATH PENALTY: ALIVE AND WELL?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COTTER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COTTER. Mr Speaker, one of the ablest reporters that I know, Bob Waters, has written a thoughtful and provocative article on the death penalty.

I urge my colleagues to take a few minutes from their busy schedules to read this excellent article:

DEATH PENALTY: ALIVE AND WELL?

(By Robert Waters)

WASHINGTON.—One of the oldest news business cliches is the one where reporters tell each other: No story ever ends.

So it comes as no surprise to read that the U.S. Supreme Court, in its majestic wisdom, is on the verge of deciding the constitutionality of the death penalty—again.

The high court's 1972 decision, long awaited as the final word on this emotional issue, was something of a dud.

The court, you may remember, went off in all directions at once and came up with a 5-4 ruling that removed the shadow of death from several hundred men on death row—but settled nothing.

Primarily on the strength of a dissent by Chief Justice Warren Burger, Connecticut and 33 other states passed new capital punishment laws to overcome the court's majority ruling that capital punishment, as it then existed, was unconstitutional because it wasn't even-handed and fair.

Burger said the opinion implied that the states could pass new death penalty laws provided that the legal killing wasn't capricious and arbitrary.

How is the court going to rule this time?

The guess from this corner is that capital punishment is alive and well and will stay that way.

The high court may try to spell out the conditions a little more carefully than some of the state statutes have them at present. But it seems quite doubtful that the justices are prepared to rule that the death penalty is "cruel and unusual punishment."

This guess is predicated not on the fact that the court has become more conservative since 1972.

The most compelling argument will probably turn out to be the skyrocketing murder rate.

A recent Rand Institute study for the New York City police department gives a strong hint of the way things are going. The study, in brief, found that killings in "crimes of passion" are declining while murders where the killer and the victim were strangers are going up—perhaps as much as 36 per cent of the total homicides.

This is the worst kind of bad news for the anti-capital punishment crowd.

The ban-the-death-penalty movement is fueled in good part by the truism that most murderers didn't plan to kill their victims. It just happened. A spouse kills his or her mate in a fit of jealously or anger. A drunken boy friend is rejected and decides to get even. This pattern is familiar to nearly every police department in the land.

But any study that shows this type of killing on the decline—while "deliberate" murders show a dramatic upsurge—brings us back to a pretty basic question:

How much value does society place on the life of the victim?

Leaving aside completely any discussion of whether the death penalty will deter the crime of murder, anticapital punishment advocates must decide whether their own lives — or anyone else's—are to be valued less than the life of a deliberate murderer.

This question goes far beyond the "eye for an eye" concept of punishment and poses for all mankind the question of misplaced compassion.

In his book, "Punishing Criminals," Ernest van den Haag, brings his reader face-to-face with a most disturbing thought:

A complete abolition of the death penalty can be seen as a symbolic "loss of nerve: social authority no longer willing to pass an irrevocable judgement on anyone. Murder is no longer thought grave enough to take the murderer's life . . ."

All but the most callous who have ever witnessed an electrocution, or a hanging or any other form of legal killing, will tell you they came away from the experience with a profound sense of shock.

This revulsion has also aided the anti-capital punishment cause. It is most compelling to listen to the argument that society cheapens its own regard for human life when it passes laws permitting the death penalty.

But, in the end, this argument must turn itself around to face Haag's question: Was the life of the victim less important than the life of his deliberate murderer?

Taking the murderer's life certainly won't restore the victim's. And the arguments over the deterrent question can be endless.

But it is just possible that the Supreme Court, which can read statistics as well as anyone else, can figure out what is happening: Victims are dying, murderers aren't.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. HOLTZMAN) is recognized for 30 minutes.

[Ms. HOLTZMAN addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

CONGRESSIONAL SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING PROGRAMS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PRICE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I welcome this opportunity to join in sponsoring a resolution expressing the appreciation of Congress to a number of professional societies which have instituted the congressional science and engineering programs. These programs are designed to bring scientists and engineers into the congressional process allowing them to learn the public policymaking process, and at the some time contribute their skills and experience to the decisionmaking process.

I have the honor of being the chairman of the House Armed Services Committee and the R. & D. subcommittee, and on this committee we are faced with making policy decisions on a multitude of technological programs. Over one-half of all the federally supported R & D.

Close Senate Vote Seen

Hatch Act Accord Is Reached

By Helen Dewar
Washington Post Staff Writer

House and Senate conferees resolved differences yesterday over a veto-threatened bill to let federal workers engage in partisan politics after scuttling a Senate amendment to make it easier for Congress to raise federal workers salaries.

The compromise version of proposed Hatch Act revisions is expected to be approved soon by the House and Senate but not by the two-thirds majority of both houses necessary to override an expected veto from President Ford.

The Senate is the main stumbling block and the conferees, by rejecting key elements of the upper house's handiwork on the bill, appeared to have done nothing to improve chances of getting a veto-proof margin in that body.

The 228-to-119 House vote last year was considerably above two-thirds. But the 47-to-32 Senate vote earlier this month fell far short of the veto-override mark.

Points at issue in the conference were peripheral to the central issue of lifting the Hatch Act's nearly 40-year ban on partisan politicking by federal workers in their off-duty hours, which both houses had approved. The chief differences involved creation of an independent board to judge violations, leaves of absence for workers who run for office, exemptions for "sensitive" positions and the politically ticklish question of divorcing bureaucratic and congressional pay increases.

On the salary issue, the Senate amended the House bill to separate congressional pay raises from salary increases for rank-and-file federal workers when proposed increases exceed pres-

See HATCH, A4, Col. 5

HATCH, From A1

idential recommendations. Currently they are linked, making members skittish about approving big pay raises for workers that also increase their own salaries.

The conferees agreed to drop the Senate provision when House members noted that it violated House rules against non-germane amendments. Separate bills to do the same thing are pending in the House but are bottled up in the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

The conferees also restored House provisions for an independent board that the Senate had rejected. The board would supersede the Civil Service Commission in judging infractions of the new law, including its rules against political coercion of workers by their bosses. The CSC would retain investigatory powers.

Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee Chairman Gale McGee (D-Wyo.) agreed to the House position, saying the CSC should not be "both prosecutor and judge."

Having restored the independent board, the conferees modified Senate amendments tightening punishment provisions, including dropping a provision for dismissal of any employee found guilty of two violations of the law.

They also dropped a House proposal that federal workers be required to take leave without pay when running for full-time elective office. Rep. Herbert E. Harris (D-Va.), a House conferee, contended that such a requirement would be a "practical prohibition" against running for office by most workers.

The conferees also agreed to postpone the effective date of the law to Jan. 1, 1977, and to ban CIA employees and those holding "sensitive" positions in the Department of Justice and Internal Revenue Service from politics. The Senate had voted to ban all employees in these agencies from politics but the conferees agreed to permit such activity by those employees listed by their agency heads as holding nonsensitive positions.

Either house can reject the conference recommendations but McGee and Rep. David N. Henderson (D-N.C.), chairman of the House Committee, said they expected passage.

NEW YORK TIMES DATE 29 Apr 71 PAGE

FORD IS SUSTAINED IN HATCH ACT VETO

Bill to Give U.S. Aides Role in Politics Dies in House

By RICHARD L. MADDEN
Special to The New York Times

WASHINGTON, April 29—A Congressional effort to allow 2.8 million Federal Civil Service employees to take part in political campaigns ended today when the House sustained President Ford's veto of a bill revising the 37-year-old Hatch Act.

The vote was 243 to 160, or 26 short of the two-thirds needed to override. It was the third consecutive time this year that Congress, with its heavy Democratic majorities, had failed to override a veto.

But Democratic leaders had had little hope of overriding this latest veto because neither the House nor Senate had passed the bill by a two-thirds vote.

Except for a letter-writing effort by some labor groups urging representatives to override, there was little evidence that the Administration or the Democratic leadership had engaged in any intensive lobbying on the issue.

Voting to override were 221 Democrats and 22 Republicans; 47 Democrats and 113 Republicans were opposed.

The measure, regarded as dead for this session, would have allowed most Federal civilian workers, including those of the Postal Service, to run for political office, make financial contributions and actively participate in campaigns. It would have been effective Jan. 1.

Under the Hatch Act, named for Senator Carl Hatch of New Mexico and enacted in 1939 after the number of Federal workers increased sharply in the New Deal, Federal employers have to quit their jobs if they wish to participate in politics.

In vetoing the measure April 12, Mr. Ford said, "The public business of our Government must be conducted without the taint of partisan politics." Some Republicans also opposed the bill in the belief that many Federal workers had been hired in Democratic Administrations and might be likely to aid Democratic candidates.

Representative William Clay, Democrat of Missouri, the Bill's floor manager, argued that Federal workers should have the same political rights as other citizens. He maintained that the measure contained safeguards to prevent them from abusing their offices or being coerced by superiors to support candidates.

"We don't need it, and we don't need to make ward heelers out of bureaucrats," countered Representative Robert H. Mitchell, Republican of Illinois.

Representatives of districts in suburban Virginia and Maryland, where many Federal workers live, were divided, with some urging an override and others urging that the veto be sustained.

Representative Joseph L. Fisher, Democrat of suburban Virginia, acknowledged that the bill probably would help his campaign, but said that many of the civil servants in his district opposed it. "They view it as something forced on them they don't want," he said in urging support of the veto.